Applicant(s) Application No. ISOBE, TAKUNDO 10/743,730 Interview Summary Examiner **Art Unit** 2852 Ryan Gleitz All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): (3) Katherine Berrechia. (1) Ryan Gleitz. (4)_____. (2) Arthur Grimley. Date of Interview: 30 August 2005. c) Personal [copy given to: 1] applicant 2) applicant's representative e)⊠ No. Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description: ____. Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 6. Identification of prior art discussed: Aoki et al. JP 2000-356936. Agreement with respect to the claims f) \square was reached. g) \boxtimes was not reached. h) \square N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant presented arguments that Aoki et al. do not disclose a low frequency because the frequency is caused by the eccentricity of a roller. These arguments were not found persuasive because claim 1 was intended to claim the low frequency broadly to include the frequency caused by the eccentricity of a roller as shown by dependent claim 6. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required